

20071213.ba v04\_n120.bam.20071213

>From ???@??? Thu Dec 13 01:22:06 2007 -0600  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 06:55:41 GMT  
From: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 4120  
Message-Id: <20071213065543.9D67F47006A@srvr1.theporch.com>

BOATANCHORS Digest 4120

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) RE: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by w8au@sssnet.com
- 2) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by w8au@sssnet.com
- 3) RE: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by "Ed Zeranski" <ezeran@ezeran.cnc.net>
- 4) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by WA5CAB@cs.com
- 5) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by W7QH0@aol.com
- 6) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>
- 7) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
- 8) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>
- 9) AN/APT-5 "Carpet IV" Transmitter Needs Home.  
by "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
- 10) AM use and bandwidth  
by wb3fau@att.net
- 11) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by WA5CAB@cs.com
- 12) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by W0EOM@aol.com
- 13) Re: AM use and bandwidth  
by "Tom Smith" <tsmith@hal-pc.org>
- 14) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
- 15) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by WA1KBQ@aol.com
- 16) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>
- 17) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
by WA1KBQ@aol.com
- 18) Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....

by WA5CAB@cs.com  
19) Re: (AM) Mooooooooooooo....  
by "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>

-----  
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 22:17:10 -0500  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: w8au@sssnet.com  
Subject: RE: (AM) Mooooooooooooo....  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed  
Message-Id: <20071212031715.4A2D3470034@srvr1.theporch.com>

At 06:16 PM 12/11/2007, Dr. James C. Garland wrote:  
> > I think last year's ARRL proposal (dropped) dealt with AM as a  
> > "grandfathered entity"  
> > by stating it could keep 6 kHz BW while within the 2.7 kHz SSB sections.  
>  
>Why not just specify bandwidth per sideband?

There ya go, Jim! :-)) See if we can sneak this through.

Perry

-----  
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 22:28:02 -0500  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: w8au@sssnet.com  
Subject: Re: (AM) Mooooooooooooo....  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed  
Message-Id: <20071212032806.490F3470034@srvr1.theporch.com>

At 07:15 PM 12/11/2007, WA1KBQ@aol.com wrote:  
>how can the A3 interests  
>reasonably expect their voices to be recognized at all? A3 does not  
>cause any  
>revenue to flow anywhere. Isn't this akin to a fraternity of antique car  
>enthusiasts petitioning the state for a special use lane to keep  
>from being run  
>over by traffic that would otherwise view them as being in the way and  
>holding up progress?

The antique car buffs were catered to by the institution of "antique plates" whereby they can use the vehicles (not for commuting) and never have to buy another plate.

Does this analogy work? :-)) In a sense it does, because last year's cancelled

ARRL BW proposal did "grandfather" AM.

Perry

-----  
From: "Ed Zeranski" <ezeran@ezeran.cnc.net>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: RE: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:38:45 -0800  
Message-ID: <EMEPKDEJDNHEMLEAHGKHIEABFCAA.ezeran@ezeran.cnc.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>Why not just specify bandwidth per sideband?

There ya go, Jim! :-)) See if we can sneak this through.

Perry

Perry,

It seems I stepped on my dangly parts even addressing this. I have not been on for a while (out of the country) but seems I stepped into a shit storm...even when trying to be civil.

EdZ

-----  
From: WA5CAB@cs.com  
Message-ID: <d0e.1970ca1e.3490bbc3@cs.com>  
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 23:21:23 EST  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="part1\_d0e.1970ca1e.3490bbc3\_boundary"

--part1\_d0e.1970ca1e.3490bbc3\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Actually, either directly in the case of the AM modes or indirectly in the case of the FM modes, it already is (in the regulations). And has been for decades at least.

It just occurred to me how the dumas came up with 2.7 KHz instead of 3 KHz as his magic number to impose on all of us. It's the sorta cutesy BS thing a computer geek appliance operator with no practical knowledge might come up with

if he read a Sunday Supplement on amateur radio run during a slow week in Hartford. How he came up with the figure I'll leave as an exercise for the student.

In a message dated 12/11/2007 9:17:42 PM Central Standard Time, w8au@sssnnet.com writes:

> >Why not just specify bandwidth per sideband?

>

> There ya go, Jim! :-) See if we can sneak this through.

Robert Downs - Houston

<<http://www.wa5cab.com>> (Web Store)

MVPA 9480

<[wa5cab@cs.com](mailto:wa5cab@cs.com)> (Primary email)

<[wa5cab@comcast.net](mailto:wa5cab@comcast.net)> (Backup email)

--part1\_d0e.1970ca1e.3490bbc3\_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1\_d0e.1970ca1e.3490bbc3\_boundary--

-----  
From: W7QH0@aol.com

Message-ID: <[bbd.29a30dbf.3490dfe4@aol.com](mailto:bbd.29a30dbf.3490dfe4@aol.com)>

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 01:55:32 EST

Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....

To: Old Tube Radios <[boatanchors@theporch.com](mailto:boatanchors@theporch.com)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="part1\_bbd.29a30dbf.3490dfe4\_boundary"

--part1\_bbd.29a30dbf.3490dfe4\_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

In a message dated 12/11/07 8:22:10 PM, WA5CAB@cs.com writes:

```
> It just occurred to me how the dumas came up with 2.7 KHz instead of 3 KHz=20
> as
> his magic number to impose on all of us.=A0 It's the sorta cutesy BS thing=
a
> computer geek appliance operator with no practical knowledge might come up=
=20
> with
> if he read a Sunday Supplement on amateur radio run during a slow week in
> Hartford.=A0 How he came up with the figure I'll leave as an exercise for=20=
the
> student.=A0
>=20
```

Well, maybe the reasoning went something like this. The old (telephone?)=20  
standard voice frequency range was 300 - 3000 hz which would only require a=20=  
2700=20  
hz bandwidth to pass. Why would anyone need any more than that?=20

Dennis D. W7QHO  
Glendale, CA

\*\*\*\*\*

See AOL's top rated recipes=20  
(<http://food.aol.com/top-rated-recipes?NCID=3Daoltop000300000000004>)

--part1\_bbd.29a30dbf.3490dfe4\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1\_bbd.29a30dbf.3490dfe4\_boundary--

-----  
Message-ID: <006601c83cb2\$a7189330\$640fa8c0@radioroom>  
From: "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 06:32:08 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;  
format=flowed;  
charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=original

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well, maybe the reasoning went something like this. The old (telephone?) standard voice frequency range was 300 - 3000 hz which would only require a 2700 hz bandwidth to pass. Why would anyone need any more than that?  
>>>

2700Hz is common sense to me, based on what is required for good sounding communications audio. But that is for SSB, where the carrier is offset a few hundred Hz from the lower edge of the filter.

AM stations, at least traditional AM systems, can't offset the filters like that so they would need more than 2x 2700Hz BW. Also older amateur or communications rigs, especially high level modulated tetrodes, almost always suffer from non-linearity in the modulated stage and poor roll-off in filters. That would have to be accommodated also.

I think a reasonable solution would be to not have a bandwidth limit except to say all emissions related to bandwidth must be kept inside a certain segment, and then allow the upper 75 or 100 kHz of every band to be available for anything anyone wants to do with bandwidth. Some sort of flexible bandplan could sort the AM from wide SSB or whatever might develop in the future. Then rolloff of sidebands (for older rigs) or bandwidth limits (no brick wall filters on a plate modulated 6AQ5) would never be an issue if they didn't extend out of band. The Alabama goober truck driver group on SSB would be unlikely to hassle people about how wide they were since they would be in an unlimited BW area of the band.

This would also allow people who have always wanted to be a radio announcer or audio expert a chance to enjoy hearing the spittle hit the diaphragm or the fat cheeks rattle from gas without parking anywhere they like.

Then in the next segment down bandwidth could be limited to something reasonable for normal speech (2700Hz BW) with normal IM product levels, and then something for wider digital BW or the rig that just can't be fixed and finally something narrow (like 500Hz) for normal clean CW and narrow digimodes.

Bandplans could sort out the modes inside the segments, but the segments would serve to keep wide modes from trashing narrow modes or vice versa.

While hard headedness has always been an issue, we now have more plug and play into the mix. This would sort the big problems out and let everyone have space, and a good bandplan would polish it up. Everyone could have a place to operate without the idiotic mixing of bandwidths.

73 Tom

-----  
Message-ID: <000901c83cb5\$2c451090\$6401a8c0@boudreaux>  
From: "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 05:50:17 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    format=flowed;  
    charset="iso-8859-1";  
    reply-type=response  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Saying "2700 Hz bandwidth" is meaningless in any event.  
2700 Hz at how many dB down? And what about the  
rest of the it? Can we be 4 KC at, say, 30 dB down?  
Or do we have to build digital "brick wall" filters?  
Whoever inserted "2700 Hz" just pulled it out of the air.

-----  
Message-ID: <007e01c83cbf\$136782b0\$640fa8c0@radioroom>  
From: "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 08:01:04 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;

format=flowed;  
charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=response  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Saying "2700 Hz bandwidth" is meaningless in any event.  
> 2700 Hz at how many dB down? And what about the  
> rest of the it? Can we be 4 KC at, say, 30 dB down?  
> Or do we have to build digital "brick wall" filters?  
> Whoever inserted "2700 Hz" just pulled it out of the air.  
>

What is the link to the paper or full report that says 2700 Hz?? That might answer the question.

73 Tom

-----  
Message-ID: <002501c83cca\$a2ea17d0\$6401a8c0@boudreaux>  
From: "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: AN/APT-5 "Carpet IV" Transmitter Needs Home.  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 08:23:55 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
format=flowed;  
charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Available in the Dallas area:  
Was NIB (the box fell apart) WWII AN/APT-5 "Carpet IV"  
radar jammer transmitter. Very nice piece.  
It's heavy- about like an ART-13.  
I'd rather deliver it to someone here than ship it.  
If anyone in this area of Texas is interested,  
I'm open for trades of interesting milsurplus stuff  
or a modest amount of cash.  
73 Dave S.

-----  
From: wb3fau@att.net  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: AM use and bandwidth  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:56:35 +0000  
Message-Id:



<121220071556.1099.476004B30004EDCD0000044B22230703729B0A02D29B9B0EBF9A0E00CC0D99@att.net>

We can talk about this all we want fellas, but the plain simple truth is both CW and AM are obsolete modes. Now, don't get me wrong, we are hams, most of us like to build, experiment, run old stuff, like good old hams used to do? Unfortunately, most of the powers to be, are state of the art people, and not interested in our little special interests.

AM is a real bad hit because it takes up bandwidth to make it good sounding. As most of us are looking for. There is no point in operating AM and listening to 2.7kc.BW.

We do not get any credit for being able to assemble an AM transmitter, an SSB exciter

is much more work to build, and most new hams could not do it!

I myself like to fix stuff, and be able to do such. Perhaps that is why I own only

BA gear?

Tubes are good example of self repair- you can still buy new 6L6s, [1st made in

1937!] Try to get mosfets used in 1980 gear.

Back to bandwidth- there is competition out there for our frequencies, I think big

money will eventually win, but when?

Russ.

-----  
From: WA5CAB@cs.com

Message-ID: <d5e.1a4cef10.34916965@cs.com>

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 11:42:13 EST

Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="part1\_d5e.1a4cef10.34916965\_boundary"

--part1\_d5e.1a4cef10.34916965\_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

No. Dennis was correct as to where 2700 Hz was derived from. There is, AFAIK, not going to be any paper discussing it per se. For decades it has been taken as a given that 3 KC was adequate as an upper frequency limit for the transmission of intelligible human voice. To the point that for years it has been in the regs either directly or indirectly. Common practice has also been to roll off the lower end of the audio at 300 Hz. But there was never before any requirement to do this sharply. The roll-off was set mostly by choice of

coupling and cathode (or emitter or whatever) bypass capacitors and associated resistors, mainly a matter of economics. Plus of course the amount of iron used in transformers and/or chokes in the audio path, if any.

But if you assume a square audio bandpass of from 300 to 3000 Hz and also assume infinite carrier suppression, the resultant RF envelope is 2700 Hz wide. So the 2700 figure wasn't actually just pulled out of the air. But it certainly assumes facts not in evidence.

In a message dated 12/12/2007 7:01:44 AM Central Standard Time, w8ji@contesting.com writes:

> >Saying "2700 Hz bandwidth" is meaningless in any event.  
> >2700 Hz at how many dB down? And what about the  
> >rest of the it? Can we be 4 KC at, say, 30 dB down?  
> >Or do we have to build digital "brick wall" filters?  
> >Whoever inserted "2700 Hz" just pulled it out of the air.  
> >  
>  
> What is the link to the paper or full report that says 2700  
> Hz?? That might answer the question.

Robert Downs - Houston  
<<http://www.wa5cab.com>> (Web Store)  
MVPA 9480  
<[wa5cab@cs.com](mailto:wa5cab@cs.com)> (Primary email)  
<[wa5cab@comcast.net](mailto:wa5cab@comcast.net)> (Backup email)

--part1\_d5e.1a4cef10.34916965\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1\_d5e.1a4cef10.34916965\_boundary--

-----  
From: W0EOM@aol.com  
Message-ID: <cf2.219421de.34916a27@aol.com>  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 11:45:27 EST  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----1197477927"

-----1197477927  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Tom - on the whole subject of 'incomptent' operators or 'lids' as they were known (i have been a ham since 1951) things are not that much different.

I was reading some old 1931 QST's and the same complaints existed then. I have been researching Clyde DeVinna, W6OJ, who was an Oscar winning cinematographer and a first class CW operator. He maintained contact from Africa while shooting the movie Trader Horn about 1930 almost daily.

Will

\*\*\*\*\*See AOL's top rated recipes  
(<http://food.aol.com/top-rated-recipes?NCID=aoltop000300000000004>)

-----1197477927  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----1197477927--

-----  
From: "Tom Smith" <tsmith@hal-pc.org>  
Subject: Re: AM use and bandwidth  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 11:01:27 -0600  
Message-ID: <web-463002827@mail.hal-pc.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"; format="flowed"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Russ,

I think you hit on a very good point. This is a "special interest" item and should be respected as such. No different than any of the other "special interests" out there that are being recognized. AM isn't high tech but it is a facet of our hobby being utilized by more than a few hams that are part of the larger community of hams that have many varied special interests. We just need to work out the details for peaceful co-existence but deserve the right to study, experiment and enjoy our "special interest".

Just MHO

Tom N5AMA

On Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:56:35 +0000

wb3fau@att.net wrote:

most of the powers

> to be, are state of the art people, and not interested in our  
> little special interests.

-----  
Message-ID: <007501c83d0c\$38a7ebd0\$48a0480c@KB6NAX>

From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 14:13:19 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> This is a tough one if you stick strictly to BW....

I think this is the point that needs to be made. So common is the practice these days of simple slogan propagandization I'm coming to the conclusion that nobody knows how to think anymore without being prompted by the "communications revolution" to follow some brain dead doctrine. The Brave New World of lemmings being led over the precipice, in other words.

One of the reasons I found operating less fun, and haven't been for a number of years now, was because of the tribalization of the bands by exulted ego operators. As if the Constitution protected the right of all oscillators to drift freely (the corollary to the 2nd Amendment issue) protagonists stand

their ground and more of the young get eaten. Years ago I checked into an AM group on 75 a few times on SSB before I had AM capability. I was welcomed by a (now SK) op who was a leading enabler of AM revitalization.

But

then some of the "AM only" types started dishing crap in my direction so I withdrew. By the time I actually had AM capability I had lost interest in joining the group because the next hurdle would have been to contend with the "higher power" fat heads. It wasn't what I thought ham radio was supposed be about.

Nowadays I have more fun taking my recently acquired mutt with aggressive tendencies to the dog park every day. Over time she has learned to get along better with her new canine acquaintances and I've found the human attendees to be more humane to each other as well as to each other's dogs. Perhaps some hams could learn a few things from dogs.

Arden Allen  
KB6NAX

-----  
From: WA1KBQ@aol.com  
Message-ID: <c3d.26fdc89d.3491d0da@aol.com>  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 19:03:38 EST  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't necessarily think a band plan would be all bad but it would make it easier to cut spectrum and reassign it to other modes deemed to have the greater need. This would play right into their hands. Promote the use of a particular mode through magazine articles and advertising and cause it to flourish, award band space to it accordingly and choke out the obsolete modes. This does not solve the current potential threat and it rather hands them the tools to accomplish their mission (or some lobby group's mission). I think this is another example of follow the money. Where's the incentive for the powers that be to award spectrum to an obsolete mode only a relative few are interested in? Why should they listen to a few old diehards that refuse to give up their ancient modulation ( no pun intended); what's in it for them? If we existed in strong enough numbers to cause them to have to listen to us then I would sure feel a lot better about the situation. Maybe all that's really left is a short waiting game. Personally I would like to see stepped up enforcement but then again what would be the incentive for them to want to do that?

Greg

\*\*\*\*\*See AOL's top rated recipes  
(<http://food.aol.com/top-rated-recipes?NCID=aoltop00030000000004>)

-----  
Message-ID: <006601c83d24\$aa2d6d80\$640fa8c0@radiatoroom>  
From: "Tom Rauch" <w8ji@contesting.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 20:07:37 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    format=flowed;  
    charset="iso-8859-1";  
    reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> award band space to it accordingly and choke out the  
> obsolete modes. This  
> does not solve the current potential threat and it rather  
> hands them the tools  
> to accomplish their mission (or some lobby group's  
> mission). I think this is  
> another example of follow the money.

That's just not true.

If you put aside all the hysteria and read the web page at  
this link:

<http://www.iaru-r2.org/wp-content/uploads/region-2-mf-hf-bandplan-e.pdf>

and look at the little \* marks in the bandplan you will see  
they allow for DSB AM.

As a matter of fact they allow for DSB Am from 7100-7300kHz  
on 40M, and in two spots on 80 meters.

I wonder how many people whine before they read?

Clearly if they INTENDED to allow for DSB AM then there is  
no conspiracy. There may be a lack of experience, but no  
sinister motives like people would have others think.

None of the guys on this page:

<http://www.iaru-r2.org/>

look like the Grinch that stole AM, although the fellow on the left appears to be getting a Christmas Goose.

OK all you whiners, why did they allocate 3600-3625 and other areas, including most of 40M, for AM if they were trying to wipe AM out? Please answer.

73 Tom

-----  
From: WA1KBQ@aol.com  
Message-ID: <bbe.1cd990bc.3491e586@aol.com>  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 20:31:50 EST  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't think anyone is intentionally trying to wipe out AM and I certainly don't think there is a secret conspiracy to push it out of the way either but I do believe there are more than a few who hope it just goes away. I see no valid reason for them to want to support it other than for the few of us. AM causes no significant revenue to flow anywhere and is no more important in the grand scheme of things than an antique car hobby is to the general motoring public. What possible motive would they have to support AM? Why should they and what would happen if they didn't? Who besides the few of us would care enough to complain about it if it was gone? I think the answer is increased enforcement to force the rule breakers into compliance and observance of proper station operating procedure. When is the last time 75 meters was a model of that?

Greg

\*\*\*\*\*See AOL's top rated recipes  
(<http://food.aol.com/top-rated-recipes?NCID=aoltop000300000000004>)

-----  
From: WA5CAB@cs.com  
Message-ID: <c94.202b4a5e.34920437@cs.com>  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 22:42:47 EST

Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooo....  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="part1\_c94.202b4a5e.34920437\_boundary"

--part1\_c94.202b4a5e.34920437\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yes, it is true. You're the one with defective eyesight. Read the thing again. Currently DSB AM is legal over the entire 75 Meter band. The bandplan you are so happy with cuts that to 25 KC. What if I told you that you could only drive your car on part of Tuesday? Would you be happy, or would you whine? You'd scream of course. What right does the ARRL, who have been happily taking my dues payments for 45 years, have to take away 87.5% of what I currently have access to for absolutely no honest reason other than they think that they can get away with it?

As far as 40 meters goes, it's never been usable in this part of the country anyway. It's a worthless band.

But the bottom line is, where is their justification for changing the current rules? There isn't any, other than under the table money in their pockets. And people like you wanting to run us off the HF bands and willing to promulgate false information in order to do it. You're like the Nazis telling the Polish Jews that being forced into the Warsaw ghetto wasn't really so bad. Try it. You'll like it. You'll be close to your own kind. Until we burn the Ghetto, too.

In a message dated 12/12/2007 7:09:07 PM Central Standard Time,  
w8ji@contesting.com writes:

> That's just not true.  
>  
> If you put aside all the hysteria and read the web page at  
> this link:  
>  
> <http://www.iaru-r2.org/wp-content/uploads/region-2-mf-hf-bandplan-e.pdf>  
>  
> and look at the little \* marks in the bandplan you will see  
> they allow for DSB AM.  
>  
> As a matter of fact they allow for DSB Am from 7100-7300kHz  
> on 40M, and in two spots on 80 meters.  
>  
> I wonder how many people whine before they read?  
>



> Clearly if they INTENDED to allow for DSB AM then there is  
> no conspiracy. There may be a lack of experience, but no  
> sinister motives like people would have others think.  
>  
> None of the guys on this page:  
>  
> <http://www.iaru-r2.org/>  
>  
> look like the Grinch that stole AM, although the fellow on  
> the left appears to be getting a Christmas Goose.  
>  
> OK all you whiners, why did they allocate 3600-3625 and  
> other areas, including most of 40M, for AM if they were  
> trying to wipe AM out? Please answer.  
>

Robert & Susan Downs - Houston  
<<http://www.wa5cab.com>> (Web Store)  
MVPA 9480  
<[wa5cab@cs.com](mailto:wa5cab@cs.com)> (Primary email)  
<[wa5cab@comcast.net](mailto:wa5cab@comcast.net)> (Backup email)

--part1\_c94.202b4a5e.34920437\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1\_c94.202b4a5e.34920437\_boundary--

-----  
Message-ID: <006101c83d55\$2c417160\$640fa8c0@radioroom>  
From: "Tom Rauch" <[w8ji@contesting.com](mailto:w8ji@contesting.com)>  
To: Old Tube Radios <[boatanchors@theporch.com](mailto:boatanchors@theporch.com)>  
Subject: Re: (AM) Moooooooooooo....  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 01:55:27 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
format=flowed;  
charset="iso-8859-1";

reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Yes, it is true. You're the one with defective eyesight.  
> Read the thing  
> again. Currently DSB AM is legal over the entire 75  
> Meter band. The bandplan  
> you are so happy with cuts that to 25 KC.

Not so.

It retains the current AM Window by having a space from  
3875-3900 plus adds a new one from 3600-3625. That's 50kHz,  
not 25.

I certainly agree it needs a little work, but it isn't  
anything at all like people represented!

What if I told you that you could  
> only drive your car on part of Tuesday? Would you be  
> happy, or would you whine?

I wouldn't like being allowed to drive one day a week ...but  
if my car was ten feet wide and the rest of the cars were  
five feet wide, I'd expect to be lane restricted on busy or  
narrow roads. It's just common sense.

> But the bottom line is, where is their justification for  
> changing the current  
> rules?

What rules changed? The IARU changed a bandplan, not the  
ARRL.

In any event, rules will have to eventually change as we add  
more and more modes. Things aren't the same now as they were  
20 years ago. Letting ourselves be driven by emotions rather  
than considering facts doesn't help us as individuals, Hams,  
our country, or our planet.

People should stop spewing vitriol and help the IARU do the  
right thing.

73 Tom

-----

End of BOATANCHORS Digest 4120  
\*\*\*\*\*